App. F. IX-4

Previous References

1938. (Mezrai)

File No. 96-28-

Serial Nos. 5-9

Later References

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos. 5

Part B for June 30

SUBJECT.

G. R. S. APP F. III—1] 1928.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Judicial)

NOTES.

File No. 96 1928

FILE HEADING.

Recovery of certain amounts collected on the occasion of the last Mahamastakabhisheka at Sravanabelgola

FROM

The Dy C.

No. 962 Dated 26.8.29. Received

Diary No.	Enclos.	Spare copies -	Serial No.
296			5

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Requests that the L. R. may be consulted about the further action to be taken for the recovery of the amounts due collected by messrs. M. C. Lakshmipathiah and D. Shantaraja Shastry, and whether a suit can be filed to recover the amounts.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

1) Judl. 2. 96-28 on the subject, is submitted. The reply from the Bankers at Bombay said to have been sent in original, (vide para 2), has not been received.

DD Submitted

2) DM 30/8

NOTES—First Sheet. 30/8/29

WD 01683—GPB—5,000—3-5-29

Serial No.

6

2a. Hon Insp Cons
No 607 of 9 9-29
Advises that the reply from Messrs Gulamkhasi Sukhanand Bankers Bombay said C'house been sent in original to ... [illegible] requests ... [illegible]

FINANCIAL SECRETARY
14 SEP. 1929
No. 3447

3) The reply from Gulamkhasi Sukhanand, Bankers Bombay, received from the H C, is placed in the file. ~~may~~ will be sent to Bol. Bo. for opinion. If appd submtd

Sd 14/9/29.

4) Yes

5) Bombay

6) A statement of facts of the case and the points on which legal opinion is required may kindly be stated by the Hon Branch of the Hon Comr, as required by rule 66 of the Legal Affairs Rules. From the papers now sent, I have not been able to make out the facts of the case clearly.

Sd 20/9/29

7) Submd.

Sd 28/9/29

8) Sd 28/9/29

9) Sd 3-10-29

Note—Contn. Sheet

WD 01684—GPB—30,000—2-4-27

4759 of 30

General and Revenue Secretariat

1 Part 2 File No. 96

App. F. III—2] of 1928

Serial No.	
7	To The Inspr General C No 775 of 7-10-29 Requests to send up as required by Rule 66 of the Legal officers rules a statement of the facts of the case & the points on which he requires opinion
8	Letter No Pc 25-2/30-31 of 2-3-31 from the Mysore Commissioner submitting a note regarding Collections made on the occasion of the last Maha mastaka-Abhisheka at Sravanbelagola and requesting that the Law Secretary be consulted on points noted in para 7 of the notes and instructions as to the further action to be taken be issued - 10) Papers may be sent to L.R. for opinion (Ref:- para 7) H. Secy) 11) 16-3-31 12) To L.R with compliments. 16/3 1931 13) Forwarded with Compliments to the Government Advocate for favour of opinion on the points raised in the note attached to the Mysore Commissioner's letter of 2nd March 1931 (Page 4).

Sns (A) 7/11

L.O. No. P 70 of 30 of 8th April 1931

282

GOVT. ADVOCATE'S OFFICE. APR 1931 BANGALORE.

2nd 776 of 1930-31

Note—Contn. Sheet

dr 8.4.31

M Mahadevayya
Legal Rt Secy to Govt

WD 01684—GPB—50,000—30-1-30

Forms Revised

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No. 4k. of 193 8

Serial No.

U.O. No. 62/30.11
27.28.4.11.

Re-transmitted with compliments.

A careful perusal of the papers on the file including the copy of the receipt dated the 15th May 1925, passed by Messrs. M. Lakshmipathiah and A.Santharaja Sastry shows clearly that the amount in question represented by the Hundis is the property of the -- Swamigalu of the Sravanabelagola Matha. The receipt actually recites that the Hundis are the property of the Swamigalu, that the realisations are to be given over to the Government with his approval and in his name and that as a special case for the purpose of meeting the liability of the Jain community in this behalf (i.e., the contribution to be made by the - community towards the cost of constructing a bridge at Mandagere). The two persons abovenamed undertake, according to the receipt, to collect the amounts due on the Hundis and deposit the same with Government in the name of the Swamigalu. With these facts before us, the questions raised in the P.U.D. may be answered seriatim thus :-

Question 1: I am of opinion that the Hundis were tendered to the late Swamigalu in his capacity as the High Priest of the Sri Sravanabelagola Peetha.

Question 2: As the construction of the bridge is reported to have been given up, the amounts due on the Hundis revert to the Swamigalu who is entitled to use them for any legitimate purpose -- connected with the Matha.

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 02553—G P B—50,000—8 7 30

Question 3:

Question 3: A suit for the recovery of the amount is maintainable and may be filed by the Government on behalf of the Matha.

Question 4: The suit has to be instituted against Messrs. Lakshmipathiah and A. Santharaja Sastry only and not against the Mysore Pranthik Jain Digambara Theertha Kshetra Committee of which Mr.Brahmappa Tavanappa is the President.

Question 5: In view of the fact that Mr.Sukhanand of Bombay has intimated to Government that he has custody of the amounts already collected on some of the Hundis and that he is still collecting the others, it is necessary to add him as a party to the suit. But the further point to be considered is whether the suit so far as Mr. Sukhanand is concerned, has to be filed here or in Bombay since both the custodian and the money are outside the jurisdiction of the Mysore courts. The balance of advantage, however, lies in suing all the three persons together within the State for, such a suit, in view of the fact that Messrs. Lakshmipathiah and Santharaja Sastry are within the jurisdiction of our courts, would have a compelling effect upon Mr. Sukhanand also. If however Mr. Sukhanand becomes ex parte, then,

Serial No.

then the question of proceeding against him in the Bombay Court may have to be considered separately.

R. Ramachandra Rao
Government Advocate.

CSN/28-4-31.

Put up with comps

VS) May the above opinion be communicated to H.E.? 28/4

1st Member) 1.5.31

16) Please let me see file re 80 of 17.5.25

17) Collection containing Rs. one 249-80 Mez 210-26-7 & 19-8-2, is forthcoming

8/5/31

First Member) 18) 8.5.31

19) There is one point which is not clear to me. I refer to the answer of the Government Advocate to question No. 3. Why should the suit for the recovery of the amount be filed by the Mysore Government on behalf of the Mutt? Is not the Mutt under the direct management of the present Swami? and if so, what locus standi has the Mysore Government in this matter? It has been held that the Hundis were tendered to the late Swami in his capacity as the

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

High

High Priest of the Mutt and if the properties of the Mutt are under the management of the present Swami, any action for the recovery of the amount of the Hundis has to be taken by him and not by the Government.

20) The amount was offered as the contribution of the Jain community towards the construction of a bridge at Mandagere. The Akkihebbal bridge has now been taken up in preferance to the Manadagere bridge. I am not sure if it is right to hold that the construction of the Mandagere bridge has been abandoned for all time. If there is any prospect, however remote, of this bridge being taken up - on this point we might consult the Public Works Department - the amount in question might be held in deposit and utilised towards the construction of that bridge when it is undertaken. At any rate, we shall have to bring this point to the notice of the Swami and it is for him to decide how the money should be disposed of.

9/1573/26

21) In view of the legal opinion expressed in para 14 and of the minutes of the First Member in Council in paras 19 & 20, it is for orders if the file may be sent D.O to M.C for taking action as directed in para 20

(8

-12. F. III—2

General and Revenue Secretariat | Mysore File No. 96 | 11328

Serial No.

and for kindly furnishing information called for in para 19.

Page 4 of the Report

22 As seen from para 13 of the Adm^n. Report for 29-30, the properties of the Six Mills were managed by some Munsiff or other

G.S. 12/5

Submitted for orders

12/5/31. H. Secy)

13/5

21 May the file be laid before H.C. No. 4

First Member) 25-5-31

18/5

h

26) Forwarded H.C. with Complts to the Mysore Commr in Mysore for needful and return.

By Order

for Secy to Govt

Mys Secy No. 75-30.

14 MAY 1931 No. 9724

18 MAY 1931 MYSORE

File No. of 193

General and Revenue Secretariat

App. F. III—2]

(9)

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No. 1924

Serial No.

RC 252 / 29-80.



File returned with compliments.

27) The matha and its endowed properties are -- under the management of Government and the Swamigalu is responsible for the internal management of the -- Matha and the Basti Temples attached to it. Government in the Muzrai Department are therefore responsible for the administration of the properties and the funds belonging to the Institution. The Government, being the pro-tem managers for the time-being may file the suit in their capacity as Trustees. Orders of Government to take further action as proposed by the Government Advocate are therefore solicited.

A

28) As regards the utilization of the amount referred to in the minutes of the First Member, it seems better to be decided later on after the money is realized.



Bangalore
30/5/31

J. Majagonal
Muzrai Commissioner.

29) Submitted for orders
C.S.
3/6/31

1st Member 80 h
2/6/31

31) A. orders accordingly may be issued
Mme
7.6.31

32) [illegible] h
9.6.31

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 02568- GPB—50,000—8 7 30

10)

Mucz File No. 96 of 1928 | General a
Secr

O/P Read

S-S 9/6/31 — H. Secy)

VS 11.6.31.

97 12/6

12/6/31

Issue

VS 12.6.31

No 2684 of 16/6/31 to the Muzaffarnagar Commissioner forwarding copy of the Government Advocate's Opinion and requesting him to file a suit as indicated therein.

OS 14/6

CONFIDENTIAL.

M. C. 13]

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE,

Bangalore,.....24th August..... 1929.

26

No. 962 Enl
26-7

FROM

A. K. Syed Taj Peeran, Esq., B.A.,
The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

To

FINANCIAL SECRETARY
26 AUG 1929
No 2476

B. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of His
Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT.

SIR,

Referring to para 2 of this office letter No.C.962/26-27 dated 3rd September 1928 re amounts collected on the occasion of the last Mahamastakabhisheka at Sravanabelagola, I have the honor to state that since the date of the above communication the* marginally noted further letters were addressed to Mr. M.C. Lakshmipathaiah, General Secretary of the Mysore Jaina Thirthakshetra Committee, Mysore, and he was --- requested to arrange to get the realizations of the Hundis amounting to Rs.27058-0-9 and to collect the amounts of the still outstanding Hundis. In his letter dated 26th July 1929 (copy enclosed) ------- Mr. Lakshmipathiah stated that the sum of Rs.27058-0-9 referred to - above was still with Mr. Gurumukhari Sukhanand of Bombay, that he - had no information whether the unrealized Hundis had been collected or not and that he was going to Bombay by the middle of August 1929 to discuss the whole question with Mr. Sukhanand and requested that time till the end of August 1929 may be allowed for a definite and final reply.

* Letter dated 17th October 1928.
" " 10th December "
" " 15th July 1929.

2. As it was thought that there was no use in trusting to Mr. --- Lakshmipathaiah and that the money would be lost if matters were -- further delayed Mr. Gurumukharai Sukhanand, Bankers, Bombay, was --- requested to intimate when it would be convenient for him to remit - the amount either to the General Secretary of the Committee or to me direct. The reply received from him is submitted in original for

kind

kind reference.

3. As the amount in question seems to have been collected so far back as 1925-26 and as the directions of Government contained in para 5 of their order No.279-80 Muz.210-26-7 dated 19th August 1927 have not been complied with by messrs.M.C. Lakshmipathiah -- and A. Shantaraja Sastry, I request you to kindly consult the Legal Remembrancer about the further action to be taken and whether a suit can be filed against the party to recover the amount.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Raghunarasimha Ayyangar.

for Muzrai Commissioner.

(absent from station)

Letter dated 26th July 1929 from Mr. M.C.Lakshmipathaiya B.A., General Secretary, The Mysore Jaina Tirthakshetra Committee Mysore to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter D.O.No.962/26-27 dated the 15th instant regarding amounts collected at Shravanbelgola on the occasion of the last Mahamasthakabhishekam. I very well remember to have replied to your last letter on this subject and with a view to send a duplicate of it, I was searching for its copy, which has been unfortunately mislaid in the office. This is the reason for my delay in replying to your kind letter under reference within the 20th instant as desired, and I request that I may kindly be excused..

The sum of Rs.27,058-0-9 realised out of hundies is still with Mr. Gurumukharoy Sukhanand of Bombay. I have no information whether the unrealised hundies have yet been collected and I have written to him to furnish me with a detailed account up-to-date immediately. I had written to him also previously to remit the amount so far collected to the Government of Mysore on account the Mysore Jain Thirthakshetra Committee as advance deposit, in connection with the question of constructing a bridge at Mandagere, which he has not done. -- Mr. Gurumukharoy Sukhanand has been ill these two or three months and this is perhaps the reason for the delay. Now that Government have definitely decided in favour of a bridge at Akkihebbal as --- against one at Mandagere, the question of the future utilisation of this fund has to be considered, and I propose going to Bombay about the middle of next month with a view to discuss the whole question with Mr. Gurumukharoy Sukhanand personally and come to a final -- settlement in the matter. If you will therefore kindly allow me time till the end of next month, I will be able to write to you -- definitely and finally in the matter. Meanwhile, I will send an accurate up-to-date account of this fund, which I have asked Mr. Gurumukharoy Sukhanand to send me immediately.

I request once again that my delay which was unavoidable in these circumstances may kindly be excused.

Thanking you,

"C o p y"

For Muzrai Commissioner.

Appendix F G—1

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section Irrig

File No. 96-28

Serial No. 6

No. 607

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

To

The M-C.

Date of issue 5/9/29

Signed by K. Sivaramaiah

Sir,

Adverting to correspondence ending with your letter no. 962 Dy 26th August 29 Re the recovery of the amounts collected on the occasion of the last Mahamastabhisheka at Sravanabelagola, I am directed to state that the Reply ~~Re~~ from Messrs. Surajmukhraj Sukhanand Bankers, Bombay, said to have been sent in original

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

over

WD 063—GPB—20,000—1-8-29

has not been received with
your letter under ~~acknowledgement~~ reply,
and I request that the
same may be sent at
a very early date.

I have &c.

Dr. J. Schulz

Appendix F G—1

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section Income Tax

File No. 96-29

Serial No.

No. 775 Income.

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

To

..... The Secretary .....

Date of issue 7/10/29

Signed by Mr. T.K. Isaac Appuhamy

for

Sir,

Adverting to correspondence ending with your letter no. 962 of 26th Aug. 29 requesting legal opinion in the matter of the recovery of the amounts collected on the occasion of the Mahamastakabhisheka at Seringapatam, I am directed to request you to send up as required by Rule 66 of the Legal affairs Rules, a Statem

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

over

WD 0399—GPB—20,000—18-9-28

of facts of the case, and the point or points on which legal opinion is required.

(2) The encl. is returned for reply & dc. Sir

I have &c.

(Sd) [illegible] Secy.

M. C. 13]

No. Re 252 30-31

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER
IN MYSORE,
Bangalore, 28th February 1931

2/3

FROM

S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI, ESQ., B.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

To

Muz 96-28-8

Rajasevaparayana
B. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Secretary to Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
Financial *Department.*

SIR,

With reference to correspondence ending with your letter --- No.1502/96-28 dated 10th January 1931, re the amounts collected on -- the occasion of the last Mahamastakabhisheka at Sravanabelagola, I have the honor to forward herewith, as desired by Government in --- their letter of 31st September 1929, a note as required by rule 66 of the Rules for the conduct of the legal affairs of Government and to request that the ~~Legal~~ Law Secretary to Government may be kindly ---- consulted on the points noted in para 7 of the notes and further --- instructions as regards the action to be taken kindly conveyed to me early.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

S. P. Rajagopal

Muzrai Commissioner.

N o t e.

The Matha and the Bastis at Sravanabelagola in the ----- Chennarayapatna Taluk are Luzrai Institutions having been ---- endowed with inam villages by Government.

In March 1925 the Mahamastakabhisheka ceremony of Sri Gomateswaraswami ~~temple~~ at Sravanabelagola was conducted. By the sale of Kalasas, i.e., the right to offer worship to Sri Gomateswara during the Mahamastakabhishaka period, 34 offers for an aggregate sum of Rs.31064-0-0 were accepted and the parties made the payments in the form of Hundis on Bombay. The Hundis which were in the custody of the late Swamigalu of the Matha were handed over to Messrs Lakshmipathaiya and Santarajaiya for realizing the amounts of the Hundis and paying the same to --- Government in the name of the Swamigalu and on behalf of the Jain community towards the cost of the bridge proposed to be constructed at Mandagere. Soon after, the Swamigalu of the -- Matha and Mr. N.L. Vardhamaniah, Secretary of the Mastakabhishcka Committee, died.

2. In December 1926, the Deputy Commissioner submitted a --- detailed report about the several amounts collected on the ----- Mastakabhisheka occasion and suggested that arrangements might be made to take all necessary measures to put in the claim of the matha for the amounts, with the help of the agent. The ----- Financial Secretary to Government was thereupon requested to consult the Legislative Secretary to Government and to issue -- instructions as to the legal position and rights of the Matha in the matter. After some intermediate correspondence Government passed orders thereon in their proceedings No.279-80/Luz.210-26-7 dated 19th August 1927. As directed in para 5 of the order --- Messrs Lakshmipathaiah and Santaraja Sastry were called upon to render a detailed account of the Hundis together with information as to how many of them were realized and what was the ~~cost~~ Cash actually available, and to credit the amounts so far realized to the Government Treasury, the question of utilizing the amount being reserved, pending definite information as to the amount realized and the

the proposals made regarding its use.

3. After several reminders Mr. M.C. Lakshmipathiah stated in his letter dated 2-10-1928 that a sum of Rs. 27058-0-9 had been realized and was in deposit with Mr. Gurumukhari Sukhanand, Treasurer of the All India Jain Thirtha Keshetra Committee, Bombay, that this amount was earning interest and that he had requested the Bankers to do their best and expedite collecting the balance. The further reply promised by Mr.Lakshmipathiah was not received even though he was constantly reminded of his promise. In his letter ~~of~~ dated 26th July 1929 he intimated that he had no information about the unrealized Hundis and that he proposed to go to Bombay about the middle of August 1929 to discuss with Mr. Sukhanand the question of utilizing the fund, having regard to the fact that Government had definitely --- decided in favour of constructing a bridge at Akkihebbal as ---- against one at Mandagere.

4. Mr. Gurumukharai Sukhanand was directly written to on 2nd August 1929 requesting an early remittance of Rs.27058-0-9 either to the General Secretary to the Committee or to this offiee in which case a formal receipt would be furnished to him on - behalf of the Mysore Government. In reply, he stated that all the Hundis which were cashed by him had been drawn in favour of the Honorary General Secretary of the All-India Digambar Jain -- Thirtha Kshetra Committee and that he held the said amount as the Treasurer ~~xxxxxxxx~~ of the same and that he was unable to do anything in the matter without the sanction of the said committee.

5. Thereupon, the Financial Secretary to Government was --- requested to consult the Legal Remembrancer about the further - action to be taken in the matter and whether a suit could be filed against the party to recover the amount. A statement of facts of the case and the point or points on which legal opinion was required was called for in the Financial Secretary's letter dated 7th October 1929.

6. Before sending a final reply to the ~~xx~~ above communication it was thought advisable to write again to Mr. Lakshmipathaiya and elicit a definite reply from him. He was accordingly -----

accordingly written to, to intimate as to what arrangements had been made to get the amount of the Hundis from Mr. Gurumukharai Sukhanand and when its receipt might be ---- expected. He was reminded on the marginally noted dates

Letter d/ 30-12-1929.	) and yet no reply has been received from him
13- 2-1930	)
4- 8-1930	) till now.
9-10-1930	)
8-12-1930.	) 7. No useful purpose will be served by

further correspondence in the matter. The action to be taken to get the amount of the realized Hundis and also the unrealized ones has to be determined now. The ----- questions for consideration are

(i) Whether the Hundis paid by the several gentlemen who purchased the Kalasas were tendered to the late Swamigalu in his capacity as the High Priest of the Sri Sravanabelagola Peeta or as President of the Mysore Prantik Jain Digambara Thirthakshetra committee of which the late Mr. M.L. Vardhamaniah was the Secretary;

(ii) Whether in view of the fact that the construction of a bridge at Mandagere-towards the cost of which the amount was meant to be contributed has been - abandaned, the realizations from the Hundis ---- may be utilized for kindred objects or may remain with the Matha, as the Swamigalu is the custodian of the image of Sri Gomateswaras and in connection with which the Mahamastakabhisheka is held;

(iii) Whether a suit for the recovery of the amount is maintainable and if so, whether the suit has to be filed by the present Swamigalu of the Matha or by the Government of Mysore, as the management of the Matha properties is vested in them;

(iv) Whether the proposed suit has to be filed against Messrs L. [illegible] and ... Sathyaraja Sastry who took charge of the Hundis and furnished a receipt to the Matha or against the Mysore ------- Prantik Jain Digambara Thirtha Kshetra Committee

of which Mr. Brahmappa Tavanappanavara is now the President,

& (v) Whether it is necessary to make Mr. Gurumukharai Sukhanand as a party to the ~~xxix~~ suit.

8. The entire file of papers is enclosed for reference and kind return.

Muzrai Commissioner.

DR 2684/May 96-28-?
End of file of records.

15th June 1931.
16/31

Financial ~~Sec~~

The Kuzrai Commissioner,
Bangalore.

With reference to correspondence ending with your Unofficial Note No. P.C.252 of 1930-31 dated 30th May 1931 I am directed to forward herewith copy of opinion of the Government Advocate in the matter of recovery of amount collected on the occasion of the last Mahamastakabhisheka at Sravanabelagola and to request you to be so good as to take necessary action accordingly in consultation with the Government Advocate to file a suit against the parties concerned, the cost of the suit being met from the funds at the credit of the institution.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Sd/- B. Srinivasa Iyengar,
Secretary to Government,
Financial ~~Secretary~~ Deptt.

(2 & 3)
2686-87

2.

Memo No. D.6 85 dated, Bangalore, the 15th June 1931 Fy-Pb.6

Copy of the foregoing is forwarded with compliments to the Comptroller, (2) Govt. Advocate and to (3) Secretary, Law Department.

By order,

V Subrahmanyasastri

For Secretary to Government,
Financial Department.

C.R.G.5

Appendix F G—1

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section M/13

File No. 76 — 28

Serial No. 9.

No. 2654

1 + 1 file of records.

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193* .

To

M.C

Date of issue 16.6.31

Signed by Dy. V.S. Secretary

Sir,

With reference to correspondence ending with your U.O note P.C. 25.2/30-31 dt. 30-5-31 ~~dt. 2.6.31~~ ~~requesting instructions in~~ regard to action to be taken for recovery of amounts collected on the occasion of the last Mahamastakabhisheka at Sravanabelgola, I am directed to forward herewith copy of opinion

[over

Govt. Advocate

of the ~~Law Secretary~~ ~~referred by the G.A~~ in the matter
of ~~attaching~~ summary of amounts collected on the occasion of the late Maharaja's Death
send to register the Lord ~~mayor~~ Mayoralty (Mrs. Lilla Scarth Policy of Secrecy)
as to take action accordingly

in Consultation with the G.A
to file a suit against ~~when such you deem it necessary~~, c and c - Lady
~~The~~ the Cost of the suit to be ~~met~~ with
being met from the Funds at ~~a party to the suit~~
the Credit of the Institution. The parties concerned.

I have Etc

11.6.31

For Secretary

Home Dept

Memo No 2685 Dt 16.6.31

Copy of the above is forwarded
with Compliments & the Comptr
for information.

B. O

11.6.31

for Secretary

Home Dept

2686-87 Dt 16.6.31

Copy to the G. A. & Secy, Law Dept

Gs
11/6/31